DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 801 CS 504 162

AUTHOR Austin, Bruce A.
TITLE Portrait of an Art Film Audience.
PUB DATE 28 Apr 83
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association (Ocean City, MD, April 27-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; *Audiences; Communication (Thought Transfer); *Films; *Media Research
IDENTIFIERS *Art Films; *Audience Analysis; Audience Response

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to create a portrait of a contemporary art film audience. A survey containing open- and close-ended questions was sent to 329 persons on the mailing list of the International Museum of Photography at the George Eastman House in Rochester, New York, an institution that also runs an art theatre. Among others, analysis of the 226 usable surveys that were returned produced the following conclusions about this group: (1) they are highly educated, enthusiastic movie-goers; (2) they are more likely than other film audience samples to report movie-going as their favorite leisure activity; (3) they are frequent movie-goers; (4) they perceive their art film theatre as offering a unique alternative to commercial cinemas; (5) a majority planned their last attendance at the art theatre at least one week in advance; (6) while the typical attendance unit was the couple, 30% attended alone the last time they went; (7) they are interested in learning about the films they see; and (8) unlike the majority of U.S. movie-goers, they express only a modest preference for American films over foreign movies. (JL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED229801

PORTRAIT OF AN ART FILM AUDIENCE

BRUCE A. AUSTIN

Rochester Institute of Technology
College of Liberal Arts
Rochester, New York 14623

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Austin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Paper Presented

to

The Eastern Communication Association
Annual Convention
Mass Communication
28 April 1983
Ocean City, Maryland

CS 504 162

PORTRAIT OF AN ART FILM AUDIENCE

The audience for the arts in the United States has long been a topic for scholarly investigation. And, for equally as long, conclusions drawn by various scholars concerning the arts audience have often been at odds. Tocqueville's study of America in the 1830s, for instance, offers an optimistic forecast for a democratization of the arts audience; contrariwise, Veblen's observations, made just over 50 years later, led him to conclude that the arts were destined to remain the preserve of the social elite.[1] Unlike such traditionally acknowledged "high culture" art forms as ballet, opera, and theater, about whose audience much is known,[2] research focusing on the art film audience is scant.[3] In 1960 Chamberlin observed what is still true today:

> not enough research has been done which bears on art houses, film societies, and museum and university film programs. We don't know enough about the composition of audiences, about attendance patterns, and about ways in which certain kinds of motion pictures affect film-going.[4]

Recently Austin suggested the utility of studying film audiences and the contexts of their movie experience: "Just as one would not attempt to interpret, in any meaningful and valid sense, nonverbal communicative behavior without the benefit of context, so too film audience research needs to consider and address the role of varying contexts of the movie

experience." As examples he offered three such contexts in need of investigation: type of exhibition hall (e.g., drive-ins, single screens, and multiplexes), type of distribution (e.g., first-run and subsequent-run), and specific film-types (e.g., art films, cult films).[5] This paper reports the results of a survey which sought to paint an empirical portrait of the contemporary art film patron.

The art film theater is an exhibition hall specializing in offering particular kinds of motion pictures -- often associated with foreign films -- to a selective (as opposed to general, or mass) audience. An operationally loose, but for the present purposes, adequate, definition of the art film is offered by Twomey: "films from other countries, reissues of old-time Hollywood 'classics,' documentaries, and independently made films on offbeat themes."[6] In short, art film theaters exhibit films which lie outside of the mainstream Hollywood product. What reasons explain the lack of research on these theaters' audience? Prior to 1950 such theaters were simply too few in number; hence the audience for their fare was necessarily limited. As Toffler notes, "in the late 'forties there were about a dozen movie houses -- half of them in New York -- that regularly screened so-called art films."[7] The sparsity of such theaters can be accounted for by the dearth of domestic product and restrictive trade practices that effectively blocked the importing of nondomestic films: both explanations are, of course, a function of the vertically integrated U.S. film industry oligopoly which was not broken until the 1948 consent

decree.[8] While the number of art film houses today is clearly not overwhelming (Toffler estimated there were 500 in 1964[9]), a reasonable expectation would be that an increasing number of screens (though not necessarily houses) will be devoted to art films given the increasing segmentation of the film audience,[10] a process encouraged by competition from other visually recorded media and by the multiplex exhibition trend.[11] In fact, one contemporary observer has reported that today "we have a proliferation of art theaters around the country," somewhere in the area of 1,000, a phenomenon accounted for by the hypothesis that movies "may be in the process of redefining themselves more clearly as an art form."[12]

Development and Growth of the Art Film Theater and Audience

The development and growth of the art film theater and its audience may be traced to the late 1940s. "The rise of the art film -- mostly imported footage -- is highly significant, coming as it did during a decade that saw movie attendance drop from 60 million a week to 40 million."[13] Jowett suggests that following the 1948 consent decree, domestic production fell and the importing of foreign films rose.[14] With fewer American-made movies to select from and increased competition among exhibitors for the U.S. pictures available, and the divestiture of the U.S. majors' exhibition arm from their production and distribution branches, "movie theaters compensated by filling their screen time with independent and foreign films and reissues"[15] -- the program material of the art theater.[16]

Most film historians agree that the Paramount decision, with its multiple consequences, was a key factor which engendered the rise of the art theater.[17] Adler reported that in the decade following the consent decree the number of art theaters increased five-fold. According to Twomey, in 1956 there were 226 theaters devoting all their screen time to art films and another 400 theaters which programmed such fare on a part-time basis.[18] Balio suggests two ramifications of the Paramount decision as causes for the increased number of art film houses: the "boom in independent production" and exhibition and the diminished power and effectiveness of the Production Code Administration to control the content of domestic production (the PCA's power was further weakened by the 1952 Miracle decision).[19] Virtually concurrent with the Paramount decision was the introduction of TV which, Twomey posits, also played an important role in the growth of art films and art film theaters. Television usurped much of Hollywood's audience, causing producers and exhibitors to become more specialized in response to the fragmentation of the film audience.[20] Twomey cites three additional reasons for the nurturing the art film: "the establishment of film libraries and the study of film appreciation in colleges and universities, . . . the widespread wartime use of documentary film . . . [which] helped create audience interest in new film themes and techniques" and the emergence of "many 16-mm. movie societies."[21]

Conceptually, the foreign film has been perhaps most closely and popularly allied with the art film. Mayer wrote in 1978

that the history of the foreign film "in the United States over the past 25 years has been one of extreme volatility and unpredictability."[22] Despite this, interest in such films grew following the end of the Second World War. Adler argued that this interest was, in part, due to "the vast number of Americans who traveled abroad during and since World War II."[23] Twomey held that "two events [were] largely responsible for the foreign film's quick gain of a faithful and expanding audience in the U.S.": British producer J. Arthur Rank's ability to have his "prestige pictures" distributed by Universal-International and the "widespread publicity" and critical endorsement of Rosselini's Open City.[24] Mayer offers a list of nine factors accounting for the development of foreign film importation including increased sophistication of audience tastes, "the trend away from isolation," and the U.S.' presence in the United Nations which "created a broader interest in foreign customs and practices."[25] Finally, Max Laemmle, owner of an art house in Los Angeles, commented that he got into the art film business in the early 1950s due to "the very stiff competition that existed for Hollywood films" and based on his previous experience from occasionally booking European films and their -- to his surprise -- success in attracting audiences.[26]

Contemporary art film theaters, it appears, may differ from more commercial houses not only in terms of programming but also ambience. At Randy Finley's Seven Gables Theater in Seattle, for instance, patrons can play chess, browse through books, and drink free coffee and tea before the show; on rainy

nights the theater provides umbrellas for those waiting in line at the ticket booth.[27] Whether or not Finley's approach is typical of the art film house is not known.

Competition for the art film house, and a sore point among many of these exhibitors, comes from nontheatrical exhibitors such as film societies and university programs.[28]

To summarize, the art film and its exhibition in the United States began to grow as a viable form about 1948. Legal, technological, and marketplace factors all contributed to its growth. The extant literature on this form of exhibition suggests a steadily increasing number of patrons, pictures, and places of availability. The art film appears to have created a significant niche for itself in the motion picture market for audiences, exhibitors, and producers.

Previous Literature

According to one study, which surveyed a national sample of 3,005 individuals in 1973, nearly three-quarters of all Americans felt that movies were "primarily light entertainment," as opposed to an "important form of artistic expression;" 71% chose the former response option, 11% the latter, and 10% said "could be either." The perception of movies as artistic expression tended to be positively related to the respondents' level of education and their frequency of attendance at cultural events; it was inversely related to their age and level of income. A related question inquired as to the sample's interest in going to see "old films," which could be interpreted as including

film "classics." Here it was found that 58% had "some interest" and 39% had no interest. A positive relationship between respondent level of education, income, and frequency of attendance at cultural events was found; interest in seeing such films was negatively related to age.[29]

Informal and anecdotal reports on the art film audience have tended to paint an elitist, and occasionally unflattering, picture of art film patrons. Pauline Kael suggests that

> the educated audience often uses "art" films in much the same self-indulgent way as the mass audience uses Hollywood "product", finding wish-fulfillment in the form of cheap and easy congratulation on their sensitivities and their liberalism.[30]

Systematic study of the art film audience is scarce. Nevertheless, one would suspect that the art film audience is an aggregate of individuals who carefully select their movie fare. Yet the results of a survey of a UCLA film series audience and the Santa Barbara Film Society members in 1960 belie this: "the art-film devotee probably goes to everything that sounds halfway promising."[31] Adler's research, reported in 1959 also partially confirms this. He found that the type of picture was "relatively unimportant to the art-film addict" when deciding which picture to attend.[32]

Two studies, both conducted in the 1950s, comprise virtually the entire body of empirical research on this topic. In the earliest report, Smythe et al. conducted personal interviews with 728 patrons at one theater in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois,

from November 1951 to April 1952.[33] The second study, conducted by Adler, used a similar methodology: personal interviews with a total of 128 patrons at two Chicago theaters during a two-week period in the spring of 1954.[34] Both studies reported that art film fans tended to be avid movie-goers, were young, had a high level of education, and that males outnumbered females. Adler noted that in his sample the art film fans, as compared to "conventional" fare movie-goers, held more prestigious occupations, were a more mobile group, and were heavier consumers of other cultural activities. Smythe et al. reported that the most common influences in their sample's film choice were the type of picture and recommendations by friends; Adler found that his art film fans relied "heavily on the reputation of the producer or director, and on the recommendations of friends and reviewers."[35] In short, both studies suggest that at a time when the movie-going public as a whole was in the process of shifting from a habitual form of behavior (i.e., going to the movies) to more of a selective mode (i.e., going to a movie), the art film patron represented an elite subgroup.

METHODOLOGY

The population from which this study's sample was drawn was comprised of persons included in the mailing list of the International Museum of Photography at the George Eastman House (GEH), Rochester, New York. One function of the GEH is the operation of the Dryden Theatre, a 550 seat film-showing auditorium located on the GEH premises. Within the Rochester area

at the time when this study was conducted, the Dryden was the only theater exclusively devoted to screening art films on a continuous basis. The Dryden presents experimental films, films of historical significance, and film series on selected topics. On occasion special films have been screened which feature a live orchestra or ensemble. Admission costs $2.00 for an individual film or $15.00 for a series (some 20 to 30 pictures). Film series brochures are regularly mailed to patrons and are available at the GEH. These brochures individually provide information describing each series, information describing each film in the series to be screened (e.g., plot synopses and production credits), and the dates of the screenings.

A total of 329 names were drawn by the GEH staff from their mailing list. In March 1982 a 78-item questionnaire was mailed to these 329 individuals following the procedures suggested by Dillman.[36] A total of 226 usable surveys were returned for a response rate of 68.7%. The survey consisted of both open- and closed-ended questions. Responses to open-ended questions were content analyzed by the author.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Respondents were asked to indicate their frequency of attendance at the Dryden Theatre and were provided with a nine-point response scale ranging from "never or almost never" to "more than five times a month." Based upon their response to this question the sample was divided at the median into two nearly equal groups (the overall sample mean attendance at the

Dryden was between once and twice a month). Respondents reporting Dryden attendance of "once in two to six months" or fewer were labeled as "Occasional" (n=98 or 47.3%), while those reporting attendance of "once a month" or more were labeled "Frequent" (n=109 or 52.7%). These two sample subgroups are used for all subsequent comparisons and descriptions.[37]

Overall the sample ranged in age from 20 to 84 years ($\bar{X}$ = 49.75, Md = 51.73). Grouping the age data into six units of ten year intervals (e.g., 20 to 29 years), a marginally significant difference between the two attendance groups was found (X^2 = 10.99, df = 5, p = .051, C = .228). Occasionals were more likely to be found in the three younger categories (20 to 49 years) while Frequents were more likely to be in the three older categories (50 to 84 years), a finding which does not agree with the Adler or Smythe et al. data. Overall the sample was fairly evenly divided by sex: 48.2% were female and 51.8% were male. As was found in the Adler and Smythe et al. reports, males were significantly (X^2 = 4.88, df = 1, p = .027, C = .162) more likely to be Frequent Dryden movie-goers. For the sample as a whole, the median value of the highest level of education completed was between "completed college" and "some graduate or professional school." No significant difference by attendance group was found (X^2 = 6.16, df = 5, p = .290 and t = .97, df = 200, p = .332, two-tailed). The relatively high level of formal education found in the present sample agrees with the findings reported by Adler and Smuthe et al.[38]

Results of an open-ended question inquiring as to the sample's

favorite leisure-time activity are reported in Table 1. Among

---

Table 1 About Here

---

both attendance groups reading was the preferred leisure activity. Movie-going as a leisure activity was mentioned more than twice as often among the Frequents than the Occasionals and was ranked third for the sample as a whole. Compared to other studies which have asked the same or a similar question concerning favorite leisure activity, the present findings indicate a much greater percentage of respondents reporting movie-going: among high school students Austin found that 4.2% reported movie-going as their favorite leisure activity and among college students Austin found that 2.5% named movies (in both instances a question identical to the one in the present report was used); results of a survey conducted in Southern California during 1972 reported that 2% of the total sample named attending a movie as their favorite leisure activity.[39] The present findings, then, suggest that these art film patrons are much more passionate about their movie-going than the public at large and are more likely to mention it as their favorite leisure activity.

Related to the respondents' leisure activities is their use of the mass media. The respondents were asked six questions regarding their use of six media and provided with interval level response options. Overall the sample's reported mean movie attendance was once a month <u>not including their attendance at the Dryden</u>. Frequents attended movies (other than the Dryden)

significantly more often than Occasionals (t = -4.08, df = 203, p < .001, two-tailed). Daily television viewing and radio listening each averaged one to two hours for the sample as a whole. Differences between the attendance groups on their televiewing and radio listening were nonsignificant (television t = -1.63, df = 203, p = .105, two-tailed; radio t = 1.20, df = 203, p = .231, two-tailed) but Frequents reported viewing more television than Occasionals while just the reverse was true for radio listening.

The sample's use of three print media was also measured. For the sample as a whole the following results were obtained: an average of two books were reported as having been read in the past month, an average of four magazines were read a month, and newspaper reading averaged nearly six times a week. Based on the respondents' report of reading as the most frequently mentioned leisure activity, these findings of heavy print media consumption were not surprising. T-test comparisons between the two attendance groups for use of each medium proved to be nonsignificant. However, for each of the three print media, average use was higher among the Frequents than the Occasionals. Compared to the results reported in Table 1, this finding might suggest inconsistency of response since there the percentage of Occasionals reporting reading is greater than that of the Frequents. This inference would, however, be inaccurate because the Table 1 data refer to the respondents' favorite leisure activity, which may not coincide with the frequency with which they actually engage in the activity. Moreover it is plausible

to believe, based upon the wording of the questions, that the Frequents are reporting use of these three media without reference to serving any one specific goal (e.g., work, leisure, etc.).

A series of questions was asked concerning the respondents' attendance at the Dryden in general. First they were asked to state their most important reason for attending the Dryden

---

Table 2 About Here

Theatre. Table 2 displays the responses to this question. As may be seen, no significant difference was found between the two attendance groups. The most frequently cited reason for attendance at the Dryden was to see older cinema classics. This can perhaps best be explained in terms of the interaction of the sample's age and their reporting of movie-going as an important leisure activity: many of these individuals may have seen the films screened at the Dryden when originally released and wish to see them again, while others are aware of these pictures' reputation as "cinematic masterpieces." The Occasional group reported the opportunity to see classic films more often then the Frequents, possibly because the former group are less "serious" film-goers (in the sense of cinema scholarship) than the latter and seek such films for their nostalgic value. Other responses support this interpretation. The percentage of Frequents who reported Dryden attendance due to the great diversity of pictures shown there was twice that of Occasionals, while the

percentage of Occasionals who stated that their attendance was due to the low cost involved was twice that of Frequents. Further, additional comments written by the respondents serve to support this explanation.

By not competing with the commercial exhibitors for contemporary cinema fare, the Dryden may also assure the patron of a high-quality, low-risk movie experience. This, too, was noted by several respondents in comments written on the survey. As contrasted with commercial exhibitors, the kinds of films screened at the Dryden, the reputation of these films among aficionados, and the write-up included for each picture in the series brochure probably all contribute to providing patrons with a sense of certainty that they will not be "wasting" or "throwing away" their money. There is little difference between Occasionals and Frequents in citing as the second most important reason for Dryden attendance the quality of the movies shown.

The third most cited reason for attendance was the ability to see movies not normally shown in other theaters. As was the case for the quality of films screened, there is virtually no difference in percentages between the Occasionals and Frequents. In short, the three most important reasons for Dryden attendance, accounting for more than two-thirds of the responses, together suggest that these patrons appreciate the opportunity to engage in the special and rewarding movie experience which the Dryden offers. Written comments gave numerous "ataboys" such as "keep up the good work," "thank you," "the best thing in Rochester," "a valuable Rochester resource," "a positive

asset to Rochester living," and the sentiment that it was a privilege to see the films shown at the Dryden and that this was something special.

The audience for the Dryden is drawn primarily from the Rochester area. Responses to a question asking how far the respondents traveled one way to get to the Dryden indicated that most (53.9%) traveled between one to three (29.9%) and four to five (24.0%) miles. No significant difference between the two attendance groups was found ($\chi^2 = 1.67$, df = 5, $p > .05$, and $t = .45$, df = 202, $p = .655$, two-tailed).

The final set of questions probing attendance at the Dryden in general concerned the season of the year during which most and least attendance occurred. As may be seen in Table 3, Winter and Fall were the seasons during which attendance was greatest

---

Table 3 About Here

---

while attendance was least during Winter and Summer. There was no significant difference between attendance groups for the season in which the least amount of Dryden-going occurred. When asked why attendance was lowest in the season selected, 84% of the respondents who indicated Summer wrote that other (especially outdoor) activities precluded their attendance; among those respondents who indicated that the Winter season saw their least attendance, 76% cited as their reason the inclement weather and poor driving conditions. For the seasons during which attendance was greatest, a significant difference between attendance groups

was found. Frequent Dryden-goers were more likely to select Winter and "None" than were Occasionals; Occasionals more often chose Summer than Frequents. While there was no significant difference (X^2 = 3.70, df = 3, p = .295) between attendance groups as to their reason for selecting the season for greatest attendance, 64% of those choosing Winter reported it was a time of the year when Dryden movie-going "fit their schedule" and the weather inhibited outdoor activities (clearly these respondents were not skiers); 42% wrote that the weather was conducive for attendance during the Fall and 33% said that this time of year "fit their schedule" for attendance.

Related questions probing the season in which general movie-going was greatest and least were also asked. The season in which most frequent general movie-going occurred was Winter (36.3% of the responses) followed by "None" (22.6%), Fall (16.7%), Summer (16.1%), and Spring (8.3%). No significant difference between attendance groups was found (X^2 = 3.42, df = 4, p = .331). Among those selecting Winter, 74% wrote that movie-going fit their schedule in this season. The season in which least frequent general movie-going took place was Summer (46.7%) followed by Winter (30%), "None" (16.1%), Spring (5%), and Fall (2.2%). No significant difference between attendance groups was found (X^2 = 3.77, df = 4, p = .438). Among respondents selecting Summer, 82% wrote that the good weather was conducive to outdoor activities they wanted to engage in. By way of comparison, the 1972 study of Southern Californians found that among adults, for movie-going in general (i.e., not just art film patrons),

movie-going occurred most often in the Summer and least often in the Winter.[41]

Another series of questions was posed concerning the respondents' most recent attendance at the Dryden. To help ensure greater accuracy of response, the respondents who indicated that they had not been to the Dryden within the previous six months were instructed to skip this set of questions. Further, to reinforce the concept of most recent attendance, the respondents were instructed to write the title of the film they last saw at the Dryden. Thus, the responses to this set of questions were designed as context-specific rather than context-free. The context-specific approach is methodologically preferable since respondents' answers can be assumed more accurate, and hence valid, when respondents are asked to recall information about a specific film situation rather than Dryden movie-going in general.

When asked whether they had planned in advance or decided on the "spur of the moment" to see the film most recently attended at the Dryden, 92% indicated their attendance was planned and 8% said it was on the "spur of the moment." There was no significant difference between attendance groups on this item ($X^2 = .28$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$). A follow-up question asked how far in advanced they had decided to go to the Dryden. A six-point response option (including "don't remember"), ranging from "same day" through "more than one week before," was provided. Omitting the "don't remember" responses (2.9%), nearly half the respondents (47.9%) indicated they had decided to

attend more than one week before the film was screened, 13.7% said one week before, 25.3% "a few days before," 3.4% "one day before," and 9.6% the "same day." No significant difference between attendance groups was found ($X^2 = 5.10$, df = 5, p = .402). The data on these two items suggest that attendance at the Dryden is a planned, purposive activity that the audience sets aside time for well in advance. As one respondent wrote, she planned her Dryden movie-going "as soon as I got the schedule." A question similar to the one concerning Dryden advance attendance planning was asked with regard to the respondents' general (non-Dryden) advance film attendance planning. Table 4 compares the

---

Table 4 About Here

---

data on these two questions. Advance planning for attendance at the movies in general occurs most often "a few days before" actually going. A significant difference was found between the extent of advance planning for Dryden film attendance and movies in general. The percentages reveal that general movie-going is planned less far in advance than Dryden attendance. No significant difference between attendance groups was found for planning of general cinema-going ($X^2 = 7.51$, df = 4, p = .110).

The respondents' source of information for particulars about the Dryden film they had last seen (e.g., show-time, date of screening) was the published series brochure (accounting for 88% of the total responses; 89% of the Frequents and 95% of the Occasionals). Other sources of information included the

respondents' spouse (4%), friends (3%), relative or date (1% each); 2% checked "don't remember." For movie-going in general, more than two-thirds (69%) of the respondents reported that they most often used newspapers as their source of information on what movies were playing. This finding is congruent with that reported by the Los Angeles Times, which found that 61% of its respondents turned to newspapers "to keep informed on what movies are playing" (the Times' survey and the present survey used an identical question).[42]

The attendance unit most frequently reported was the couple (46% of the responses). Thirty percent reported attending the Dryden alone the last time they went. No significant difference ($X^2 = 12.32$, df = 6, p = .055) between attendance groups on the attendance unit question was found, although Frequents more often reported attendance alone than Occasionals. The most common relationship of the respondents' companion was their spouse (accounting for 42% of those reporting attendance in the company of at least one other person) or a "friend other than a date" (24%).[43]

Table 5 presents responses to an open-ended question which asked why the respondents chose to attend their most recent Dryden film. Interest in the cast and the film-type were the

---

Table 5 About Here

---

predominent reasons given. When asked more specifically what about this film appealed to them most before they attended,

essentially the same two reasons were reported. These data are reported in Table 6. For both questions no significant

---

Table 6 About Here

---

difference between attendance groups was found. While information contained in the Dryden series brochure was relatively infrequently reported as a reason for attendance, it should be noted that unless the respondent had actually seen the film before, first-hand knowledge of the cast and theme, as well as virtually all of the other reasons offered, was probably dependent upon either the Dryden brochure or word-of-mouth.

The respondents were asked to report the importance of 28 variables in their most recent Dryden film attendance decision. The variables, with modifications appropriate for the art film context, have been used in previous studies of film attendance decision-making.[44] For each variable a seven-point rating scale was provided labeled at one end "very unimportant" and at the other "very important." The survey instructions presented above the list of variables again reinforced the concept of most recent attendance. Table 7 presents the mean score and standard

---

Table 7 About Here

---

deviation for each of the 28 variables and their rank relative to the other variables for the sample as a whole and the two attendance groups. T-tests for differences in mean values between

the two attendance groups were computed.[45] As has been found in previous research on the general cinema audience, plot and genre proved to be the most important variables. Frequents evaluated the synopsis presented in the Dryden brochure as significantly more important than Occasionals. (For all eight variables where a significant difference was found, the Frequents evaluated each variable as more important than the Occasionals.) In short, the three key variables that were evaluated as most important in contributing to the sample's most recent attendance decision were plot, genre, and the brochure write-up. With the exception of the last item, these variables are not different from those reported by the general movie audience when making their movie attendance decision. However, as noted earlier, it is impossible for one to have first-hand knowledge of a film's plot or genre a priori. While this is usually a confounding factor in studies of the general movie audience, this art film audience has the opportunity to determine the attractiveness of a film's plot and genre by using the brochure write-up in addition to other sources. Further, this finding agrees with that reported by Smythe et al.

On the other hand, unlike the general cinema audience and the findings of Adler and Smythe et al., this art film audience indicated that comments about the film by friends were relatively unimportant to their attendance decision. Movie attendance decisions for this sample's art film attendance, then, do not appear to be as susceptible to interpersonal influence as those of other movie audiences, perhaps because of the audience's

reliance on the series brochure and their knowledge of film. Adler's study found that his art film fans relied heavily on the reputation of the producer or director when making attendance decisions. Here it was found that the four off-screen production personnel (director, producer, screenwriter, and cinematographer) were all evaluated far below the midpoint of the seven-point scale. This finding tends to match those found by Austin in his research on college and high school students and the Los Angeles Times (with the exception of cinematographer which was not offered for evaluation in those studies). However, the present art film audience did evaluate especially the director, but also the producer and screenwriter as much more important than did the college or high school samples. Finally, cast members (male and female star) were also near the top of the list, but still below the scale midpoint, of important variables in the attendance decision process. In brief, the findings presented in Table 7 serve to support those offered in Tables 5 and 6.

To assess the percentage of variance accounted for by these 28 variables, they were entered by forward stepwise inclusion in a multiple regression analysis with frequency of attendance at the Dryden as the dependent variable. The summary portion of this analysis is presented in Table 8. As may be seen, somewhat more than one-third of the Dryden attendance variance was

---

Table 8 About Here

---

explained by 24 variables. This compares with 28.6% for college students and 31.4% for high school students using the same stepwise procedure.

Both Adler and Smythe et al. reported that their art film audiences tended to be avid movie-goers. The final portion of the present study reports the Dryden audience's movie-going habits in general. As has already been reported, this sample's average movie attendance (not including the Dryden) was once a month. When asked whether they decided to see a particular picture before deciding when to go to the movies, or whether they decided to go to the movies before deciding which picture to see, most (92%) reported the former. This finding supports that of the Los Angeles Times study and the concept of contemporary movie-going as a purposive, as opposed to habitual, behavior (i.e., going to a movie rather than the movies). No significant difference between Dryden attendance groups was found ($X^2 = .003$, df = 1, p = .953). Two other questions further probed related attendance habits. Frequents were significantly more likely than Occasionals to report attending movies on a fairly regular basis rather than "in streaks" ($X^2 = 13.19$, df = 1, p = .001, C = .259). Still, 66% of the sample as a whole reported that their attendance could best be typified as being "in streaks," a finding virtually identical to that reported by the Times study. The respondents were asked to "suppose there were a great number of movies [they] wanted to see playing at the same time." Given this hypothetical situation, which would they do: increase their movie-going so as to see them all or

pick and choose a few with the hope of seeing the others at a later time? Overall, 60% of the sample indicated they would pick and choose while 40% indicated they would increase their movie-going. A greater percentage of adults in the Times study said they would pick and choose (76%) than selected the increased movie-going response option (24%).[46] No significant difference ($X^2 = .64$, df = 1, p = .420) was found between attendance groups although more of the Frequents reported they would increase their movie-going than Occasionals (57% compared to 43% respectively).

Two questions concerning movie attendance and admission cost were asked: do you think you would go to the movies more (less) often if ticket prices were less (more) expensive? Table 9 reports the sample's response to these two questions.

Table 9 About Here

For each question no significant difference in response by attendance group was observed. When the results of these two questions were crosstabulated for the sample as a whole, Cramer's V = .516. These data suggest that about half the sample would alter their frequency of movie attendance as a result of changes in the cost of admission; the Los Angeles Times reported similar findings on this point. One quarter of the present sample indicated that fluctuation in ticket price would make no difference to their attendance behavior (on this point percentages were higher in the present study than those reported by the Times).[47]

Three questions were asked concerning where the respondents went when they attended movies. When asked (open-ended question) what local theater, if any, they attended most regularly, 30% of those naming a theater said the Dryden. Only one commercial exhibitor had more mentions (two) than the Dryden. Frequents mentioned the Dryden five times more often than Occasionals. The two remaining exhibition-hall questions inquired as to actual behavior regarding and preference for drive-in as opposed to walk-in theaters. Ninety-eight percent reported they attended walk-ins more frequently than drive-ins; 1% said the reverse and 1% said they attended drive-ins and walk-ins equally as frequently. No significant difference by attendance group was found ($X^2 = 2.47$, df = 2, p = .290). A virtually identical result was found when the respondents were asked to "suppose there was a movie you wanted to see and it was playing at both a drive-in and a walk-in theater:" 98% reported they would go to the walk-in, "all things equal," and 2% indicated the drive-in. No significant difference by attendance group was observed ($X^2 = 2.82$, df = 1, p = .093).

The survey also asked the respondents to name the title of the film they enjoyed most and least in the previous year. Following each of these questions they were asked to explain why (open-ended question) they liked and disliked the movies they named. Table 10 reports the results of these two questions.

Table 10 About Here

For both their favorite and least favorite film no significant differences between Frequents and Occasionals was found. For the movie they enjoyed least, fully three-quarters of the reasons offered had to do with various elements of the film's story. More than half the sample reported that the movie was dull, uninteresting, did not compel their attention, or that the story was "well worn" with no unusual plot devices to attract their attention. Smaller sample percentages wrote that the story lacked credibility or that they found the story offensive. In short, by and large, the reason for disliking a movie had to do with its story. Almost half the sample reported the same reason (in an opposite direction, of course) as explaining why they had enjoyed their favorite film of the past year. About one-third cited the picture's stars and their acting performance as the reason for enjoying the film. These two reasons -- story and stars -- are roughly analogous to the two most frequently mentioned reasons offered by the sample for their most recent attendance at the Dryden (see Tables 5 and 6). Interestingly, a greater number of discrete reasons were offered as motivating factors in Dryden attendance than were offered to explain subsequent affective response to a film.

Two open-ended questions asked the respondents to imagine that they had "moved into a town which had no movies." What type of movie would they miss most and least?[48] Table 11 displays

---

Table 11 About Here

---

the film-types that would be missed most and least. No significant difference between attendance groups was found for the film-type that would be missed most. Many respondents reported that they would miss all movies, regardless of "type," and would not move to such a place. Among those respondents who did name a film-type, foreign films, dramas, old classics, musicals, and comedies were most frequently reported. A significant difference between attendance groups was found for the film-type that would be missed least. Frequents reported they would not miss Westerns, pornographic, and foreign films more often than Occasionals. Conversely, Occasionals were more likely to report not missing horror or violent movies -- two categories which may overlap. Unsolicited written comments indicated that many members of the sample were dissatisfied with contemporary films due, especially, to the sex, violence, and vulgarity they perceived these films as containing.

The final set of responses to be reported here concerns the sample's relationship to foreign films. As was noted earlier the art film is often conceptualized -- however erroneously -- as being virtually synonymous with the nondomestically-made film. First the respondents were asked if they had attended a foreign-made film in the past six months. Among those responding ($n = 202$), 59.4% indicated they had attended a foreign movie, 34.6% said they had not, and 6% did not remember. A significant difference ($X^2 = 14.44$, $df = 2$, $p = .001$, $C = .258$) between attendance groups was observed: Frequents were nearly twice as likely to have attended a foreign film as Occasionals. Next the

respondents were asked to indicate on a seven-point Likert-like scale how much or little they have enjoyed foreign films they had seen. Overall the sample reported a moderately favorable degree of enjoyment ($\bar{X}$ = 5.17); no significant difference ($t = -.81$, $df = 195$, $p = .420$, two-tailed) between attendance groups was found but Frequents expressed a more positive response than Occasionals. Two questions probed the sample's preference for and enjoyment of foreign films as compared to American movies. A five-point Likert-like response option was provided for each question. Here it was found that there was a slight preference for both actually going to see and subsequent enjoyment of American movies over foreign films. No significant difference between attendance groups on either item was found although Frequents reported stronger preference for and enjoyment of American films than Occasionals (for preference $t = -.07$, $df = 201$, $p = .947$, two-tailed; for enjoyment $t = -.11$, $df = 199$, $p = .912$, two-tailed). Pearson product-moment correlations were computed between the sample's enjoyment of foreign films in general and their preference and enjoyment of foreign films compared to American pictures.[49] All three correlations were positive and significant at .001. The two comparative (to U.S.) questions correlated at .91; enjoyment in general correlated with preference for seeing foreign films compared to U.S. at .62; enjoyment in general correlated with enjoyment compared to U.S. films at .59. Finally, an open-ended question asked the respondents to name the one country's films, if any, they most liked. Table 12 presents the results of this question. In all, eleven

---

Table 12 About Here

---

nationalities were reported. France and Britain clearly topped the list, each accounting for about one-quarter of the total responses. And, as the results of the three previous survey questions would suggest, American films were the third most frequently mentioned. Although Frequents reported more different nationalities than did Occasionals, no significant difference between the attendance groups was found. These data on the Dryden sample's relationship to nondomestic films may suggest that while perhaps the art film audience experiences a broader range of films (in terms of nationality) than the general film audience, their actual preference for and enjoyment of movies remains largely wedded to domestic and English-language releases. Of course, a direct comparison between the art film and general audience was not made here so this inference must await confirmation by future research.

The present study has examined the composition of and a host of factors relative to one art film audience. In general, the present sample can be described as highly educated, enthusiastic movie-goers. This group, moreso than other film audience samples, is more likely to report movie-going as their favorite leisure activity. Based on <u>either</u> their frequency of attendance at the Dryden <u>or</u> movies in general, the present sample would be classified by the Opinion Research Corporation as "frequent" movie-goers (attendance of at least once a month). The ORC

reported that frequent movie-goers (the highest level designated) represented 23% of the total adult public in 1977.[50]

The Dryden audience perceives their art film theater as offering a unique alternative to the commercial cinemas. The Dryden has the appeal of presenting a diversity of high quality pictures that are not available elsewhere. The most recent attendance at the Dryden was planned at least one week in advance by 60% of the sample, which differs significantly from their general movie-going behavior. While the typical Dryden attendance unit was the couple, fully 30% attended alone the last time they went, a much higher percentage than is found for movie-going in general.

The Dryden audience is interested in learning about the films it sees. Respondents reported their enjoyment of the introductory comments about films presented before the screening and indicated they would be interested in obtaining additional supplementary background information as well. These remarks were not solicited by questions presented in the questionnaire. This art film audience appears to be more cosmopolitan than the general movie audience as well. Unlike the majority (70%) of U.S. movie-goers,[51] the Dryden audience expressed only a modest preference for American films to foreign movies.

Whether the art film audience described here is typical of all such art film audiences remains a question for future research. The present report has taken a preliminary step toward analyzing one context of the movie-going experience.

FOOTNOTES

[1]See Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America (New York: New American Library, 1956) and Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study in the Evaluation of Institutions (New York: Macmillan, 1899).

[2]See for instance National Research Center of the Arts, Americans and the Arts: A Survey of Public Opinion (New York: Associated Councils of the Arts, 1975) which reports the results of a national survey of 3,005 people; a recent review of literature may be found in Paul DiMaggio and Michael Useem, "Cultural Democracy in a Period of Cultural Expansion: The Social Composition of the Arts Audiences in the United States," Social Problems 26 (December 1978): 179-197.

[3]This is not to suggest that such studies are absolutely nonexistant; the extant literature is reviewed below.

[4]Philip Chamberlin, "The Art Film and Its Audience: I. Allies, Not Enemies: Commercial and Nontheatrical Experience on the West Coast," Film Quarterly 14 (Winter 1960): 38.

[5]Bruce A. Austin, "The Motion Picture Audience: A Neglected Aspect of Film Research," paper presented at the Ohio University Film Conference, April 1982, Athens, Ohio (available in ERIC).

[6]John E. Twomey, "Some Considerations on the Rise of the Art-Film Theater," Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 10 (Spring 1956): 240.

[7]Alvin Toffler, The Culture Consumers (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 21. William A. Orton suggests that "until the coming of sound, [there were] perhaps two or three dozen

small exhibitors maintaining a somewhat precarious existence for special types of audience." See "Motion Pictures: Social Implications," Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences 11 (1933): 66.

[8]For a discussion of the Paramount Decree see Michael Conant, Antitrust in the Motion Picture Industry (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960) and Ralph Cassady, Jr., "Impact of the Paramount Decision on Motion Picture Distribution and Price Making," Southern California Law Review 31 (February 1958): 150-180.

[9]Toffler, op. cit., p. 21.

[10]In 1977 Bob Rehme, at that time vice president of New World Pictures, a major distributor of foreign films, said about the art film audience: "It's a very specialized market and a very limited number of exhibitors can handle it. . . . You have to go out and develop customers." See S.J. Diamond, "At Art Movie Theaters, Real Art is in the Selling," Los Angeles Times, April 24, 1977, sec. 6, p. 2.

[11]For a discussion of multiplexing see Gary Edgerton, "The Multiplex: The Modern American Motion Picture Theater as Message," paper presented at the Popular Culture Association Conference, March 1981, Cincinnati, Ohio.

[12]Thomas M. Kando, Leisure and Popular Culture in Transition, 2nd ed. (St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1980), p. 149. The U.S. Commerce Department estimates that there are some 13,329 indoor theaters regularly exhibiting motion pictures. Cited in Richard Gertner (Ed.), Motion Picture Almanac 1982 (New

York: Quigley Publishing Co., 1982), p. 30A.

[13]Toffler, op. cit., p. 21.

[14]He presents tabular data which shows that the number of U.S. produced pictures dropped from 378 in 1946 to 272 in 1956, a 28% decline, while during the same time period the number of imported pictures increased by 132%, from 89 to 207. Garth Jowett, Film, The Democratic Art (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1976), p. 346.

[15]Jowett, ibid., p. 346. Twomey, op. cit., p. 242, presents a similar analysis suggesting that the Paramount decision offered "greater freedom for exhibitors in the selection of films."

[16]It is important to italicize the fact that foreign-made films usually do not constitute the only type of motion pictures screened at art film theaters, although they may be the majority: however, no data are available which present precise comparative percentages of U.S. to foreign fare. From a historical perspective, foreign filmmakers have typically been viewed as filmic innovators. Jowett (ibid., p. 57) recounts that the feature length film was first popularized when Adolph Zukor imported the multi-reel (four) Queen Elizabeth, starring Sarah Bernhardt, to the U.S. in 1912. According to Jowett, American exhibitors at the time were of the opinion that audiences simply would not sit still for any film longer than ten or fifteen minutes. And, interestingly, "after the initial flurry of interest before 1920, American audiences showed a definite distaste for 'foreign' films, including those from Britain" (pp. 204-205).

[17]See for instance: Tino Balio, "Retrenchment, Reappraisal,

and Reorganization: 1948 --," in Tino Balio (Ed.), The American Film Industry (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1976), pp. 315-331; Thomas H. Guback, "Hollywood's International Market," in Balio (Ed.), ibid., pp. 387-409; Michael F. Mayer, The Film Industries, 2nd ed. (New York: Hastings House, 1978), pp. 66-73; Twomey, op. cit., pp. 239-247.

[18]Kenneth P. Adler, "Art Films and Eggheads," Studies in Public Communication 2 (Summer 1959): 7; Twomey, op. cit., p. 240.

[19]Balio, op. cit., pp. 318-319. See also Guback, op. cit., p. 398. For information on the Miracle decision see Richard S. Randall, Censorship of the Movies: The Social and Political Control of a Mass Medium (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968) and Burstyn v. Wilson, 303 N.Y. 242, 101 N.E. 2d 665 (1951); 343 U.S. 495 (1952).

[20]Twomey, op. cit., p. 240. In a similar vein, Adler, op. cit., p. 7, notes that "the plethora of run-of-the-mill Hollywood films [were] now so easily available at home and on the TV screen."

[21]Twomey, op. cit., p. 241, related to the first reason, Adler, op. cit., p. 7, has noted "our steadily rising level of education."

[22]Mayer, op. cit., p. 67.

[23]Adler, op. cit., p. 7.

[24]Twomey, op. cit., pp. 245-246.

[25]Mayer, op. cit., pp. 68-69. He also presents eight items which may work against this trend (pp. 70-72).

[26]David Paletz and Michael Noonan, "The Exhibitors," Film Quarterly 19 (Winter 1965-1966): 23-24.

[27]See Marion Mauk, "An Artist in the Art of Pushing Little Films," Los Angeles Times, November 15, 1981, Calendar sec., p. 37.

[28]For a discussion on this point see Chamberlin, op. cit. and Henry Breitrose, "The Nontheatrical Film, 196)," Film Quarterly 14 (Spring 1961): 40-42. Laemmle discusses this point in Paletz and Noonan, op. cit., p. 31.

[29]National Research Center of the Arts, op. cit., p. 40.

[30]Pauline Kael, "Fantasies of the Art-House Audience," Sight and Sound 31 (Winter 1961-1962): 5.

[31]Chamberlin, op. cit., p. 39.

[32]Adler, op. cit., p. 10.

[33]Dallas W. Smythe, Parker B. Lusk, and Charles A. Lewis, "Portrait of an Art-Theater Audience," Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television 8 (Fall 1953): 28-50.

[34]Adler, op. cit., pp. 7-15.

[35]Adler, ibid., p. 10.

[36]Don A. Dillman, Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978). Copies of the questionnaire are available from the author.

[37]A three-group sort was also constructed but results of analyses on the data did not prove to be meaningfully different from the two group sort. In the following discussion of the survey results inferential statistics are used. The justification for using inferential statistics with a nonprobability

sample may be found in Robert F. Winch and Donald T. Campbell, "Proof? No. Evidence? Yes. The Significance of Tests of Significance," American Sociologist 4 (May 1969): 140-143.

[38]Collection of other demographic and attribute data such as income, occupation, marital status, race, religion, and political affiliation were not obtained. Questions on these variables were prepared and presented in the draft of the questionnaire but their inclusion was overruled by the GEH administration based on funding concerns. However, given the data collected on the education variable, it can be suggested that the sample is probably an upscale one in terms of occupation and income. If this speculation is true then Adler's findings on occupation would be confirmed. Difference by sex on the education item was nonsignificant ($X^2 = 4.86$, df = 5, p = .433).

[39]See Bruce A. Austin, "The Salience of Selected Variables on Choice for Movie Attendance Among High School Students," paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Conference, February 1982, Denver, Colorado (available in ERIC ED 210 754); Bruce A. Austin, "Film Attendance: Why College Students Chose to See Their Most Recent Film," Journal of Popular Film and Television 9 (Spring 1981): 43-49; Los Angeles Times, A Look at Southern California Movie-Going (Los Angeles: Los Angeles Times, 1972), p. 7.

[40]For newspapers reading t = -.94, df = 204, p = .348, two-tailed; for number of magazines read a month t = -.41, df = 202, p = .680, two-tailed; for number of books read in the past month t = -.46, df = 202, p = .649, two-tailed.

[41]Los Angeles Times, op. cit., p. 35.

[42]Los Angeles Times, p. 47.

[43]The Los Angeles Times (p. 30) reported 50% of the adult attendance unit was the couple and only 5% reported attending alone the last time they went to the movies.

[44]See Austin, "The Salience of Selected Variables on Choice for Movie Attendance Among High School Students," op. cit., Austin, "Film Attendance," op. cit., and the Los Angeles Times, op. cit., pp. 42-43.

[45]Since a significant difference by sex between the two attendance groups had been found (see above), two-way ANOVA on the 28 variables was also computed. Significant ($p < .05$) main effects for sex were found on only three variables (title, American film, and incidental expenses) and one significant ($p < .05$) interaction effect was found.

[46]Los Angeles Times, op. cit., p. 36.

[47]Los Angeles Times, p. 38.

[48]These questions were originally used by Smythe et al., op. cit. [illegible] category [illegible]

[49]The seven-point enjoyment in general scale was collapsed to a five-point scale for these computations.

[50]Reported in Richard Gertner (Ed.), Motion Picture Almanac 1981 (New York: Quigley Publishing Co., 1981), p. 32A.

[51]Gertner, Motion Picture Almanac 1982, op. cit., p. 32A.

TABLE 1

Favorite Leisure-Time Activity of Art Film Patrons

	Occasional (n=85)	Frequent (n=102)	Total (n=187)
Reading	38.8%	29.4%	33.7%
Sports	20.0	16.7	18.2
Movie-going	7.1	18.6	13.4
Hobbies	7.1	8.8	8.0
Outdoor Activities	5.9	7.8	6.9
Music	9.4	3.9	6.4
Other*	11.8	14.7	13.4

$\chi^2 = 9.06$, df = 6, $p > .10$

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

*includes dance, travel, socializing, television, live theater; each category had five responses or fewer.

TABLE 2

Most Important Reason for Attending the Dryden Theater

	Occasional (n=80)	Frequent (n=93)	Total (n=173)
To see "classic" films	30.0%	22.6%	26.0%
Quality of films screened	18.8	19.3	19.1
To see rarely exhibited films	17.5	18.3	17.9
Other	18.8	10.8	14.5
Diversity of films screened	7.5	14.0	11.0
Enjoy seeing films	2.5	12.9	8.1
Inexpensive	5.0	2.2	3.5

$x^2 = 11.24$, df = 6, p = .081

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

TABLE 3

Season of the Year in Which Most and Least Dryden Attendance Occurred

	Occasional (n=76)	Frequent (n=85)	Total (n=161)
Most			
Fall	26.3%	21.2%	23.6%
Spring	13.2	10.6	11.8
Summer	27.6	9.4	18.0
Winter	23.7	36.5	30.4
None in particular	9.2	22.3	16.2
	$X^2 = 14.51$, df = 4, p = .005, C = .287		
Least			
Fall	2.3%	1.0%	1.6%
Spring	0.0	2.1	1.1
Summer	43.7	45.4	44.6
Winter	48.3	35.0	41.3
None in particular	5.7	16.5	11.4
	$X^2 = 8.86$, df = 4, p = .064		

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

TABLE 4

Comparison of Advance Planning for Dryden and General Movie-Going

Attendance decision made:	Dryden* (n=146)	Movies in general (n=215)
Same day	9.6%	17.7%
One day before	3.4	12.6
A few days before	25.3	47.9
One week before	13.7	11.2
More than one week before	47.9	10.7

$X^2 = 70.66$, df = 4, $p < .001$, C = .404

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

*the "don't remember" responses were eliminated and percentages adjusted accordingly

TABLE 5

Reasons for Going to the Most Recent

Dryden Film Attended

	Occasional (n=44)	Frequent (n=88)	Total (n=132)
Interested in the type of film	20.5%	27.3%	25.0%
Interested in/enjoy the cast member(s)	22.7	21.6	22.0
Other	29.6	18.2	22.0
Had a series ticket	2.3	12.5	9.1
Write-up in series brochure	13.6	6.8	9.1
Recommendation by friend	4.6	5.7	5.3
Interested in film's director	4.6	3.4	3.8
Rare film	2.3	4.6	3.8

$x^2 = 7.73$, df = 7, p = .356

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

TABLE 6

Most Important Reason for Most Recent Dryden Attendance

	Occasional (n=44)	Frequent (n=86)	Total (n=130)
Interested in/enjoy cast member(s)	25.0%	33.7%	30.8%
Interested in/enjoy theme of film	20.5	18.6	19.2
Other	13.6	10.5	11.5
Film's reputation	13.6	8.1	10.0
Because it was a foreign film	6.8	7.0	6.9
Had seen the film before	11.4	4.7	6.9
Interested in film's director	2.3	7.0	5.4
Rare film	4.6	5.8	5.4
Write-up in series brochure	2.3	4.7	3.9

$x^2 = 5.51$, df = 8, p = .701

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

TABLE 7

Mean Scores[a] and Rank Order for Importance of Dryden Attendance Variables

	Total			Occasional			Frequent		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank	$\bar{X}$	SD	Rank
Plot	4.78	2.01	(1)	4.95	2.09	(1)	4.70	2.01	(2)
Genre	4.67	2.03	(2)	4.89	2.07	(2)	4.50	1.98	(3)
Brochure write-up*	4.54	1.95	(3)	4.02	2.06	(3)	4.90	1.77	(1)
Had seen movie	3.81	2.38	(4)	3.97	2.35	(4)	3.87	2.41	(4)
Female star	3.78	2.18	(5)	3.63	2.36	(6)	3.86	2.12	(5)
Title	3.70	2.23	(6)	3.86	2.43	(5)	3.64	2.17	(7)
Male star	3.60	2.21	(7)	3.16	2.18	(7)	3.84	2.20	(6)
Foreign film	3.29	2.24	(8)	2.93	2.34	(12)	3.49	2.20	(8)
Subtitled dialogue	3.07	2.36	(9)	3.15	2.57	(8)	3.07	2.34	(12)
Director	3.05	2.13	(10)	2.81	1.98	(14)	3.10	2.21	(11)
Music	3.04	2.12	(11)	2.86	2.15	(13)	3.10	2.09	(10)
Had a series ticket**	3.04	2.16	(12)	2.12	1.77	(18)	3.39	2.21	(9)
Cost of admission	3.03	2.16	(13)	3.00	2.22	(11)	3.02	2.15	(13)
Dubbed dialogue	2.98	2.27	(14)	3.12	2.51	(9)	2.96	2.18	(14)
American film	2.90	2.14	(15)	3.07	2.35	(10)	2.78	2.02	(18)
Friends' comments	2.78	1.97	(16)	2.73	2.16	(15)	2.86	1.92	(17)
Oscar nomination*	2.62	2.05	(17)	2.12	1.78	(19)	2.88	2.15	(15)
English dialogue	2.59	2.03	(18)	2.58	2.23	(16)	2.55	1.92	(19)
Oscar winning*	2.59	2.09	(19)	2.09	1.82	(20)	2.88	2.21	(16)
Newspaper critics	2.37	1.87	(20)	2.39	2.02	(17)	2.43	1.85	(21)
Newspaper ads*	2.30	1.83	(21)	1.86	1.57	(23)	2.53	1.86	(20)
Screenwriter*	2.20	1.57	(22)	1.76	1.24	(24)	2.32	1.61	(22)
Cinematographer	2.10	1.64	(23)	1.86	1.55	(22)	2.29	1.70	(23)
Color photography*	2.08	1.68	(24)	1.57	1.19	(26)	2.23	1.73	(24)
How new the film was	2.08	1.73	(25)	2.02	1.82	(21)	2.13	1.68	(27)
Producer	1.99	1.48	(26)	1.67	1.16	(25)	2.20	1.64	(25)
Black & White photo*	1.98	1.55	(27)	1.54	1.07	(27)	2.14	1.57	(26)
Incidental expenses	1.71	1.41	(28)	1.48	1.02	(28)	1.91	1.61	(28)
$\bar{X}$ by column	2.95			2.76			3.06		
SD by column		1.98			1.93			1.99	

[a] 1 = very unimportant, 7 = very important

*$p < .05$, two-tailed between Occasional and Frequent

**$p < .001$, two-tailed between Occasional and Frequent

TABLE 8

Summary Table for Stepwise Regression with Frequency of Attendance at the Dryden as the Dependent Variable

Predictor Variables	R^2	Beta
Had a series ticket	.102	.233
Newspaper ads	.134	.194
Genre	.173	-.217
How new the film was	.205	-.315
Foreign film	.238	.376
Male star	.263	.290
American film	.284	-.208
Color photography	.306	.259
Director	.320	-.225
Friends' comments	.328	-.105
Title	.335	-.007
English dialogue	.345	-.216
Cinematographer	.351	.168
Dubbed dialogue	.357	.155
Subtitled dialogue	.360	-.008
Newspaper critics	.363	.008
Oscar winning	.364	.183
Oscar nomination	.369	-.175
Screenwriter	.370	-.004
Female star	.371	.003
Plot	.371	-.003
Had seen movie	.372	-.002
Music	.372	.002
Black & White photography	.372	-.002

Constant = 4.803
Overall F = 1.682
df = 24, 68
$p > .05$
Adjusted R^2 = .151
n = 93

TABLE 9

Variations in Frequency of General Movie-Going Dependent Upon Price of Admission

	would attend more if ticket prices were less expensive?[a]	would attend less if ticket prices were more expensive?[b]
Yes	52.7%	59.2%
No	18.0	18.3
Makes no difference	29.3	22.5

$X^2 = 2.79$, df = 2, $p > .25$

[a] for differences in responses by attendance group $X^2 = 2.24$, df = 2, p = .325

[b] for differences in responses by attendance group $X^2 = 1.24$, df = 2, p = .536

TABLE 10

Reasons for Enjoying Favorite Film and Disliking Least Favorite Film

	Occasional (n=71)	Frequent (n=82)	Total (n=153)
Reasons for Enjoyment			
Interest and involvement in plot/story	43.7%	45.1%	44.5%
Acting/stars	32.4	29.3	30.7
Other*	12.7	12.2	12.4
Cinematography	5.6	7.3	6.5
Pace of the film	5.6	6.1	5.9
	$x^2 = .34$, df = 4, $p > .75$		
Reasons for Disliking	(n=46)	(n=63)	(n=109)
Dull theme/story	54.3	52.4	53.2
Offensive theme/story	10.9	14.3	12.8
Other*/don't recall	26.1	23.8	24.8
Plot was unbelievable	8.7	9.5	9.2
	$x^2 = .33$, df = 3, $p > .95$		

*fewer than four responses for each category

TABLE 11

Movie-Types that would be Missed Most and Least

	Missed Most		
	Occasional (n=77)	Frequent (n=85)	Total (n=162)
No preference	18.2%	15.3%	16.7%
Foreign	14.3	17.6	16.0
Drama	18.2	8.2	13.0
Old classics	9.1	16.5	13.0
Musical	9.1	14.1	11.7
Comedy	11.7	9.4	10.5
Art/repertory	6.5	10.6	8.6
Adventure	9.1	4.7	6.8
Light entertainment & Romance	3.4	3.5	3.7
	$x^2 = 8.29$, df = 8, $p > .25$		

	Missed Least		
	(n=86)	(n=87)	(n=173)
Horror	27.9%	16.1%	22.0%
Other	20.9	17.2	19.1
Violent	18.6	12.6	15.6
Western	8.1	19.5	13.9
Science fiction	10.5	8.0	9.2
Slapstick comedy	8.1	8.0	8.1
Pornography	1.2	9.2	5.2
Foreign	1.2	5.7	3.5
Musical & Romance	3.5	3.4	3.5
	$x^2 = 26.69$, df = 8, $p < .001$, C = .364		

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

TABLE 12

Favorite Film Nationality

	Occasional (n=77)	Frequent (n=91)	Total (n=168)
France	32.5%	20.9%	26.2%
Britain	19.5	26.4	23.2
USA	14.3	18.7	16.7
Italy	7.8	12.1	10.1
No preference	13.0	4.4	8.3
All others*	13.0	17.6	15.5

$x^2 = 8.49$, df = 5, $p > .10$

totals may not equal 100 due to rounding

* includes Australia, Bulgaria, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Poland, and Sweden; each was mentioned fewer than 9 times.